

Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum
Board of Directors
Minutes

August 22, 2002
4:00 P.M.

Monday Afternoon Club
Willows, Ca.

Chair Jane Dolan called the meeting of the Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum to order at 4:00 p.m. at the above location. It was determined there was a quorum of (12) voting members present.

County	Public Interest	Landowner	Agency
Butte	Jane Dolan	Shirley Lewis	
Colusa	(David Womble)	Ben Carter	
Glenn	(Denny Bungarz)	Don Anderson	
Shasta	Glenn Hawes	Dan Gover	
Sutter	(Dan Silva)	Russell Young	
Tehama	Bill Borrer	Brendon Flynn	
Yolo	Lynnel Pollock	Marc Faye/Lewis Bair	
Resources Agency			Mel Dodgin
Cal DWR			(Dwight Russell)
Cal DFG			Diana Jacobs
State Reclamation Board			(Pete Rabbon)
USF&WS			(Marie Sullivan)
US COE			(Mark Charlton)
Bureau of Reclamation			(Laura Allen)
Names listed in parentheses represent absences			
Also present an estimated audience of 30			
Manager Burt Bundy			
Assistant Pat Brown, Recording Secretary			
The Resources Agency			Tim Ramirez

1. **Public Participation, Unscheduled Matters:** Lynnel Pollock announced the selection of Anjanette Martin as the new General Manager of the Colusa Basin Drainage District. Anjanette will continue as chair of the SRCAF Technical Advisory Committee. Carol Wright, Sacramento River Partners (SRP), announced two meetings have been scheduled to gather input from the public to help in the development of a management plan for the Del Rio Wildlife Area. The first meeting will be August 29th at the Chico City Hall, Room one, the second will be held on September 4th at the Ordbend Community Hall at 7:00 p.m. SRP is interested in determining what the different interests are for that area and what facilities are most needed. They also have questionnaires available for those who cannot attend. Visits to the property will be made available if anyone is interested. The SRCAF will be involved in facilitating the meetings to help with public involvement. Jessica Rios, Friends of the River, introduced herself and informed the group she would be available to

answer any questions that might arise during the discussion later on segments of the “Boxer Bill”.

2. **Consent Calendar** –

Adoption of Minutes - Russell Young moved, seconded by Don Anderson to adopt the June 27th, 2002 minutes. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Acknowledge 2002 changes to the Handbook – Burt Bundy, Manager, discussed the changes in data regarding ownership acres in the Conservation Area as a result of the 2002 amendments. He also referred to additional changes to the language in the glossary and forward. There was a suggestion made that the dates shown on page iv in the Forward, “Riparian Habitat Committee 1987-1999” should be changed to 1993 –1999 to more accurately reflect the history; 1993 reflects the date the Committee was reconvened. Tom Evans, Family Water Alliance (FWA), repeated their request for removal from the Handbook any reference to setback levees; they will come back to the Board with a formal request for an amendment to remove that language. Shirley Lewis raised a question about Table 4-5, page 4-10, as to whether there should be additional language to clarify why the acreage totals shown in the IRZ are different than those shown in the Conservation Area (Reach 2) while the numbers are the same in Reach 3 and 4. It was noted that the language on Page I-5 explained the action that had taken place to remove the originally designated outer boundary of the Conservation Area except in Shasta and Tehama Counties. It was suggested that a notation be added to the table referring to page I-5 for the explanation of the differences. There was also a request that when discussing private ownership (Page 4-13), language should include references to homes and ag-related buildings. There was discussion as to whether the sentence “*Private ownership includes both agricultural lands and lands with various types of vegetation*” should be changed to read “Private ownership “may” include homes, etc., otherwise it would have to be an all-inclusive list, or deleted in its entirety. It was also noted that the references to ownership in the tables refer to what is mapped. Brendon Flynn moved that the sentence be removed in its entirety, Marc Faye seconded the motion. Following additional discussion Bill Borrer moved to table discussion to the next meeting to see if language can be developed to address the issue, Russell Young seconded the motion, motion carried 11 –Yes 1 –No. Glenn Hawes moved to accept the new Handbook language, with the exception of Page 4-13, Dan Gover seconded the motion. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

3. **Discussion of possible designation of a Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Sacramento River National Conservation Area in Tehama & Shasta Counties** -

Kelly Williams and Chuck Schultz from BLM were introduced to discuss the possible designation. Kelly gave a brief overview of the area involved, approximately 17,000 acres in Shasta and Tehama Counties. In 1993 this area was determined to be an Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC), a BLM designation only. Designation of this area as a National Conservation Area requires passage of specific congressional legislation and is the least restrictive of the designations. The purpose is to protect nationally significant resources while still allowing compatible uses to continue. Under the conservation area designation, current activities such as hunting, grazing, motorized boating, hiking, and horseback riding would all continue. BLM would have 3 years from

the date of enactment to develop a comprehensive management plan for the area. The planning process would include the public in the development of the plan. A question was asked about what changes would come from this designation; Chuck noted that one of the most significant changes would be notoriety because of proximity to the I-5 corridor. The designation, however, would also increase funding which would help manage the lands and deal with the additional use of the area. Asked about possible impacts to private lands that exist within the ACEC and potential conservation areas, Kelly noted (1) they cannot acquire land without consent of landowner and (2) there are no federal restrictions on what you do on private land. One impact could be a possible increase in property values. It appears unlikely the bill will make it through this Congress but it is expected to be re-introduced in the next Congress. Brendon asked for clarification on the status of a piece of property in the area that had been purchased by BLM with the understanding a portion of it would be kept in agriculture. There was some discussion on whether there was overlap between the SRCAF and BLM; Chuck suggested this forum could serve as an important arena for discussion and input in their planning process. Burt commented rather than overlapping, these efforts complemented each other; the SRCAF provides public input tied to the Sacramento River and local concerns while the BLM represents a more national view. This discussion today and the opportunity for involvement in their management plan showed that the process was working.

4. **Agency Reports –**

- Tim Ramirez, Resources Agency, updated the group on the Comprehensive Study in place of John Passerello who was unable to attend. Several regional meetings were held to discuss the draft of the Interim Comprehensive Report 2002. They are still working on the report as a result of the considerable input received at those meetings. More information will be available by the next Board meeting.
- Tim also gave an update on Hamilton City and the proposal submitted to CALFED by The Reclamation Board. The CALFED Management Group has recommended funding; they are waiting for the technical review to be completed. Letters of support of the proposal were received from the SRCAF, The Nature Conservancy, and the Hamilton City Community Services District; Tim noted the letters were extremely helpful and he thanked the Board for helping this to move forward.
- Paul Ward, CDF&G, reported on the Butte Creek Spring Run Chinook- high temperatures and resultant bacteria have caused a high adult mortality with 1500 fish dying; however, they also show over 9000 fish still alive. John Merz mentioned there are encouraging signs at Big Chico Creek but Paul noted they don't have numbers in as yet.
- Greg Werner, The Nature Conservancy, was introduced. Greg is involved in the DF&G planning effort and will be the lead on the DF&G planning document.
- M&T/Llano-Seco – Tim reported he and Rebecca Fris, CALFED, will be meeting with Les Heringer to work on revising the proposal that had been recommended as directed action.
- RD 108 – Lewis Bair reported they are moving forward also on revising their proposal for a Consolidated Pumping Facility and Fish Screen, also initially recommended as directed action.

5. **Committee Reports –**

Executive Committee – In the interest of time the Chair reported briefly that the Executive Committee had reviewed the content and structure of today’s Board meeting.

Landowner Assurances Committee (LAC) – Ben Carter gave a brief history of the LAC, the need for the Good Neighbor Policy (GNP), the structure of the Policy, and where it goes from this point. Ben noted this is a policy statement for the SRCAF to be used as a guideline, it is not intended as a regulation. The front part of the document (through Policy Actions nos. 1. and 2.) has been reviewed thoroughly; Policy Actions 3,4,5, & 6 require additional work and will evolve over time. It was also noted that as the back part of the document evolves and changes, it would impact the front part of the document as well. Carol Wright commented that language on page 8 referring to baseline studies needed further discussion. It would, among other things, alter the project review format. It was determined that the TAC was the appropriate place to discuss the issue and would be put on the next agenda. The LAC recommended that (1) the SRCAF Board review the Policy, (2) that SRCAF legal counsel review the Policy for possible legal consequences to the Forum if portions of the Policy are implemented, (3) the TAC review the language regarding baseline studies and (4) that the GNP Actions 1 & 2 be incorporated in the project review process and economic analysis efforts of the PILT/Economic Committee. A “report of reviews” of the GNP will be on the September Board agenda. It was noted USF&WS has a letter with comments on the Policy that will be presented when a representative can be present at the LAC meeting.

The group thanked Ben for his efforts in the development of the GNP. The LAC will meet again on September 4th and continue its work on the Policy.

PILT/Economic Committee – The Committee is ready to review the draft of the Socio-Economic Study being prepared by Jones and Stokes for TNC when it is available.

Outreach Committee – The marketing firm is revising the brochure and should have a third draft outline available shortly for review.

TAC – Discussion continued at the TAC on the status of the directed action proposals and the CALFED review process & timeline.

Burt noted the annual Advisory Council meeting was scheduled for November, either the 6th or the 13th, and asked for comment on which date would work best for everyone. Bill Borrer noted the Sacramento River Watershed Program is in the process of hiring a coordinator and looking at strategic planning; he will give a presentation to the Board at a future date. The Advisory Council meeting date was tentatively set for November 13th. A plaque was presented to Ben Carter in appreciation for his efforts as Chairman of the SRCAF Board.

6. Next Meeting - The Executive Committee had asked the Board to look at the possibility of changing the date of the Board meetings to the third Thursday of the month rather than the fourth. Following discussion, it was decided the September meeting would remain on the fourth Thursday, September 26th. Additional discussion on future dates will be placed on the next agenda.